

## REMARKS

Applicant has amended claims 1-9, and has cancelled claims 2-19, during prosecution of this patent application. Applicant is not conceding in this patent application that the subject matter encompassed by said amended and cancelled claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, since the claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of this patent application. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue the subject matter encompassed by said amended and cancelled claims, and to pursue other claims, in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-8, 12-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Salas et al (US Patent: 5,317,686, published: May 31, 1994) in further view of Hatakeda et al (US Patent: 6,057,837, published: May 2, 2000, filed: Jul. 15, 1997).

The Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Salas et al (US Patent: 5,317,686, published: May 31, 1994) and Hatakeda et al (US Patent: 6,057,837, published: May 2, 2000, filed: Jul. 15, 1997), in further view of MATHCAD (MathSoft Inc., published: August 1999, pages 140-141).

The Examiner rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Salas et al (US Patent: 5,317,686, published: May 31, 1994) and Hatakeda et al (US Patent: 6,057,837, published: May 2, 2000, filed: Jul. 15, 1997), in further view of Hashemi (US Application: US 2003/0212804 A1, published: Nov. 13, 2003, filed: May 9, 2002).

Applicant respectfully traverse the § 103 rejections with the following arguments.

**35 U.S.C. § 103: Claims 1-4, 6-8, 12-19 and New Claims 20-38**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-8, 12-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Salas et al (US Patent: 5,317,686, published: May 31, 1994) in further view of Hatakeda et al (US Patent: 6,057,837, published: May 2, 2000, filed: Jul. 15, 1997).

Since claims 2-4, 6-8, and 12-19 have been cancelled, the rejection of claims 2-4, 6-8, 12-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Applicants respectfully contend that claims 1, 26, and 33 are not unpatentable over Salas in view of Hatakeda, because Salas in view of Hatakeda does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 1, 26, and 33.

For example, Salas in view of Hatakeda does not teach or suggest the feature: “entering, by said processor, into cells of the multidimensional table located within the specific record: (i) at least one input field label respectively corresponding to the at least one input field such that each input field label is entered into a respective unique cell within the specific record and (ii) an output label corresponding to the output field such that the output label is entered into a specifically unique cell within the specific record, said output label being expressed as a mathematical expression of one or more labels of the at least one input field label, said mathematical expression of the one or more labels consisting of a formula whose computed value is entered into cells of the output field, said records and fields of the multidimensional table consisting of either rows and columns respectively in accordance with a vertical orientation of the multidimensional table or columns and rows respectively in accordance with a horizontal orientation of the multidimensional table”.

The Examiner argues on page 3 of the final office action mailed 09/26/2006: “Salas et al teaches ... *Entering labels corresponding to the at least one input field and a label corresponding to the output field, said later label being expressed as the mathematical expression of said labels of said at least one input field* (column 8, lines 6-26: whereas, each cell is identified by a cell name/label, and mathematical expressions are expressed for a cell, using values from other cells (input cells)). Furthermore, the mathematical expressions assigned for an output field comprise one or more labels assigned to one or more input fields (Fig. 4a, reference number 45).”

In response, Applicant notes that the preceding claimed feature requires the formula of the mathematical expression to be located in a cell in the specific record within the multidimensional table, which Salas does not disclose.

Salas, col. 8, lines 6-26 refers to the mathematical expression 45 containing the formula 28 depicted in Salas, FIGS. 2a and 4a, which is not located in a cell of the table disposed in the upper window 18, but is instead located in the lower window 36 which is external to the table. See also Salas, col. 8, lines 28-59 which discloses that the lower window 36, which contains the mathematical expression and the formula therein, is in the lower window 36 which is external to the rows 10 and columns 14 of the table in the upper window 18.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claims 1, 26, and 33 are not unpatentable over Salas in view of Hatakeda, and that claims 1, 26, and 33 are in condition for allowance. Since claims 20-25 depend from claim 1, Applicants respectfully maintain that claims 20-25 are likewise in condition for allowance. Since claims 27-32 depend from claim 26, Applicants respectfully maintain that claims 27-32 are likewise in condition for

allowance. Since claims 34-38 depend from claim 33, Applicants respectfully maintain that claims 34-38 are likewise in condition for allowance.

**35 U.S.C. § 103: Claim 5**

The Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Salas et al (US Patent: 5,317,686, published: May 31, 1994) and Hatakeda et al (US Patent: 6,057,837, published: May 2, 2000, filed: Jul. 15, 1997), in further view of MATHCAD (MathSoft Inc., published: August 1999, pages 140-141).

Since claim 5 has been cancelled, the rejection of claim 5 over Salas and Hatakeda, in further view of MATHCAD under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is moot.

**35 U.S.C. § 103: Claim 9**

The Examiner rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Salas et al (US Patent: 5,317,686, published: May 31, 1994) and Hatakeda et al (US Patent: 6,057,837, published: May 2, 2000, filed: Jul. 15, 1997), in further view of Hashemi (US Application: US 2003/0212804 A1, published: Nov. 13, 2003, filed: May 9, 2002).

Since claim 5 has been cancelled, the rejection of claim 5 over Salas and Hatakeda, in further view of Hashemi under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is moot.

### CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0457 (IBM). The Attorney's reference number for this case is END-9613.

Date: May 17, 2012

/Jack P. Friedman/

Jack P. Friedman

Registration No. 44,688

Customer No. 30449  
Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts  
22 Century Hill Drive - Suite 302  
Latham, New York 12110  
Telephone (518) 220-1850  
Facsimile (518) 220-1857  
E-mail: jfriedman@iplawusa.com